25

26

27

28

1 2 3 4 **E-FILED on** 09/29/08 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN JOSE DIVISION 11 12 DAVID ALMEIDA, individually and on behalf No. C-08-02088 RMW of all others similarly situated, 13 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S 14 ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST TO RELATE v. **CASES** 15 Google, INC., a Delaware Corporation; and [Re Docket No. 16] 16 Does 1 through 10, inclusive, 17 Defendants. 18 19 Defendant Google moves to relate this action with RK West v. Google, Inc., Case No. C-08-20 21 22 23 relate to the instant one, which bears the lowest docket number. 24

03452 RMW, Pulaski & Middleman, LLC v. Google, Inc., Case No. C-08-0388 SI, and Levitte v. Google, Inc., Case No. C-08-3369 JW. All parties agree that the three cases sought here to be related are themselves related. Therefore, the only question for the court is whether those cases

It appears that, though in all four cases the defendant is Google and the case concerns the Adwords program, the similarity ends there. RK West, Pulaski & Middleman, and Levitte all deal with Google ads posted on "parked domains" and "error pages," whereas this case concerns Google charging customers for content ads who, during the Adwords bidding process, left the "CPC content bid" input blank. Furthermore, the proposed class in this case does not appear to overlap with the

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST TO RELATE CASES—No. C-08-02088 RMW **JAS** 

## **United States District Court** For the Northern District of California

1	proposed classes in RK West, Pulaski & Middleman, and Levitte. See Joint Opp'n to Mot. to	
2	Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related, 2-3.	
3	This order only determines that <i>Almeida</i> is not related to <i>RK West, Pulaski &amp; Middleman</i> ,	
4	and Levitte. It does not determine whether those cases are related to each other. That issue is before	
5	Judge Ware, whose <i>Levitte</i> case has the lowest docket number of the three.	
6	Accordingly, the court denies defendant's motion to relate.	
7		
8	DATED: 09/29/08 Romala M Whyte	
9	RONALD M. WHYTE	
10	United States District Judge	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		

1	Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:		
2	Counsel for Plaintiff:		
3	Daralyn J. Durie	ddurie@kvn.com	
4	David Jason Silbert	djs@kvn.com	
5	Ryan Marshall Kent	rkent@kvn.com	
6	Alyse Deborah Bertenthal	abertenthal@kvn.com	
7	Leo Patrick Norton	lnorton@cooley.com	
8	Counsel for Defendants:		
9		ot@liblionwoods com	
10	Alfredo Torrijos	at@kbklawyers.com	
11	Brian S. Kabateck	bsk@kbklawyers.com	
12	Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.		
13			
14	<b>Dated:</b> 09/29/08	JAS	
15		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
15 16		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17 18		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17 18 19		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17 18 19 20 21		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26		Chambers of Judge Whyte	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		Chambers of Judge Whyte	